

REMARKS:

Claims 1-11 and 30-46 were pending in the application. Claims 1, 30, 35, and 40 have been amended. Claim 47 has been added. Therefore, claims 1-11 and 30-47 remain pending in this application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment

The Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment indicates that the previously submitted response was not fully responsive regarding the ground of rejection for claim 46. Applicant respectfully submits that this claim is a dependent claim and that Applicant had addressed the corresponding independent claim in the previous response. However, Applicant has included all of the amendments and arguments of the previous response and specifically indicated that the arguments of claim 1 apply to claim 46.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-11 and 30-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection in light of the following remarks.

In particular, the Examiner asserts that the limitation “the first index key defining a group of configuration management records for a part definition, location definition or unit definition, and using a second index key, the second index key defining current configuration management records for a part definition, location definition, or a unit location” is not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. As indicated previously, Applicant submits that the limitation recited above is disclosed in Applicant’s original specification at least in Table XVI (page 22) and Table XVII (page 23), various other tables, and paragraph [0069]. Thus, claims 1-11 and 30-44 satisfy the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under § 112, first paragraph.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-11 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knoblock et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,023,699, hereinafter “Knoblock”) in view of Rivette et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,339,767, hereinafter “Rivette”). Claims 30-39 and 40-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rivette in view of Knoblock. Claim 46 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knoblock in view of Rivette and Chang (U.S. Patent 6,061,515, “Chang”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection in light of the following remarks.

To establish a prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974), MPEP 2143.03. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the limitations recited in the claims. For example, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a method comprising “accessing a relational database to obtain information regarding creation of a unit of manufacture, the relational database comprising at least one parts information lookup table, at least one location information lookup table, at least one unit storage table, and a pair of configuration management storage tables, wherein said accessing the relational database comprises using a first index key, the first index key defining a group of configuration management records for a part definition, location definition or unit definition, and using a second index key, the second index key defining current configuration management records for a part definition, location definition, or a unit location, wherein said pair of configuration management storage tables are linked together, and one of said configuration management storage tables comprises a configuration management status table and the other comprises a configuration management memo table” in combination with the remaining features of claim 1.

The Examiner cites various passages in Rivette as disclosing the limitations “using a first index key, the first index key defining a group of configuration management records for a part definition, location definition or unit definition, and using a second index key, the second index key defining current configuration management records for a part definition, location definition, or a

unit location.” For example, the Examiner asserts that the cited limitations are taught or suggested by Rivette’s Bill of Materials (BOM) table 1217 that “contains index keys such as BOM group names to access [BOM] tables 1221 and 1219.” As stated by Rivette in col. 21, line 64 to col. 22, line 15:

A BOM (bill of materials) group is a group that contains patents (and perhaps other documents) that map to a product, or that map to parts of a product. More particularly, a BOM group is a group that contains patents that map to an assembly, a subassembly, or a part, where an assembly is composed of one or more subassemblies, and a subassembly is composed of other subassemblies and/or parts.

The phrase "a patent maps to a product" means that the patent includes claims that appear to read on the product or process of making and/or using the product, and/or includes claims that are related to or relevant to the product or process of making and/or using the product, and/or that the patent discloses subject matter than encompasses the product or process of making and/or using the product, and/or that the patent discloses subject matter than is related to or relevant to the product or process of making and/or using the product.

Information on BOM groups is stored in the BOM databases 626.

Therefore, a BOM table contains information mapping a patent to a product or parts of a product. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Rivette that a BOM table includes **configuration management records**. Furthermore, there is no teaching or suggestion in Rivette that use of a BOM table is equivalent to using a first index key **defining a group of configuration management records** for a part definition, location definition or unit definition and using a second index key **defining current configuration management records** for a part definition, location definition, or a unit location.

In response to these arguments, the Examiner states that the BOM_ID is represented as the first index key and the document_ID is represented as the second index key. First, Applicant notes that the BOM_ID identifies a group of patents and does not appear to relate to a key that “defines a **group of configuration management records** for a part definition, location definition, or unit definition”, but instead relates to mapping products to patents. Additionally, the document_ID provides document identity numbers and does not appear to be an index key which **identifies the current configuration management records** for a part definition, location definition, or a unit location.

Furthermore, Knoblock and Rivette fail to teach or suggest **accessing a relational database to obtain information regarding creation of a unit of manufacture.** Instead, Knoblock relates to organization of information related to configuration and placement of equipment in field states, e.g., for visualization of a system configuration, and Rivette relates to the processing and utilizing patent information stored in databases. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references (and their combination) fail to teach or suggest this element of claim 1.

Additionally, Knoblock and Rivette fail to teach or suggest **wherein said pair of configuration management storage tables are linked together, and one of said configuration management storage tables comprises a configuration management status table and the other comprises a configuration management memo table, wherein the configuration management memo table stores configuration comments.** The cited portion of Knoblock (tables 1218 and 1217) do not store configuration comments as required by the newly amended claims.

Similar arguments apply to claims 30, 35, 40, and 47. Thus, the cited references fail to teach all of the features of the claims. Applicant submits that claim 46 is allowable since the corresponding independent claim (1) has been shown to be allowable over the prior art. Additionally, Applicant asserts that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection.

CONCLUSION:

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

Applicant has petitioned herewith for what is believed to be the appropriate extension of time. If any further extensions are necessary to prevent the above-referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension.

If any extension of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) is necessary to prevent the above-referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/6057-58302/JCH.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2008-10-02

By: /Jeffrey C. Hood/
Jeffrey C. Hood, Reg. #35198

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P. O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767
(512) 853-8800